



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,284	12/19/2000	Fernando Carlos Pereira	2000-0102	7217
26652	7590	06/02/2005	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. P.O. BOX 4110 MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748			HARPER, V PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/740,284	PEREIRA ET AL.
	Examiner V. Paul Harper	Art Unit 2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. Applicant is required to submit a substitute declaration or oath to correct the deficiencies set forth: the oath/declaration is not signed by the first inventor, Fernando Carlos Pereira.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The previous rejection is withdrawn as being satisfied.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal et al. ("AT&T at TREC-7" in Proceedings of the Seventh Text Retrieval Conference (TREC-7) ed Voorhees et al., July 1999), hereinafter referred to as Singhal, in view of Hutson (U.S. Patent 5,559,940), hereinafter referred to as Hutson

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Singhal teaches a method for doing spoken document retrieval that includes the following steps:

- accessing a database of vectors of automatic transcriptions of documents (§3.1, p. 242, §3, "Speech Recognizer" generated a recognizer transcript, "Retrieval System" using word lattices for documents) ;
- changing weights of terms in the truncated vectors to weights associated with the vectors before the vectors were truncated to form the truncated vectors, thereby creating truncated, weighted vectors (p. 247, ¶2, §3.3 re-weighting of document vectors); and
- adding to the truncated, weighted vectors any terms which were not recognized by the recognizer (p. 244, add new words).

Singhal teaches the expansion of documents by only words present in the word lattice generated by the recognizer (p. 244, i.e., only adding words that are recognized by the recognizer), but Singhal does not specifically teach "truncating the vectors by removing all terms in the vectors that are not recognized by the recognizer, thereby creating truncated vectors." However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Hutson.

In the same field of endeavor, Hutson discloses a method for real-time information analysis of textual material. Hutson further discloses the suppression or removal of unwanted words (col. 2, lines 12-20; col. 4, lines 61-67, where in this case, the unwanted words are those not recognized by the recognizer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Singhal by specifically providing the features as taught by Hutson, since it is well known in the art at the time of invention for the

purpose of reducing the size of the database for a more efficient search (Hutson, col. 1, lines 47-57) by including (only) words also proposed by the speech recognizer (Singhal, p. 244, §Lattice Based Document Expansion, ¶5).

Regarding **claims 2 and 11**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 1, and 10). In addition, Singhal teaches, “the step of comparing from the truncated vectors a retrieval of documents from the original vectors, thereby measuring effect of deletions from the original vectors on retrieval accuracy” (pp. 245, 246, Tables 4-6, §3.3, evaluated constrained document expansion allowing only terms from the recognizers).

Regarding **claims 3 and 12**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 1 and 10). In addition, Singhal teaches “the step of measuring incremental loss in retrieval effectiveness due to insertion of the terms not recognized by the recognizer (p. 245, Table 4, Expanded Docs, p. 248, Figure 1, % loss from human transcriptions).

Regarding **claims 4 and 13**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 3 and 12). In addition, Singhal teaches “the step of determining final retrieval effectiveness of the speech retrieval document using automatic transcriptions” (pp. 245-246, “Results and Analysis,” Table 6).

Regarding **claims 5 and 14**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 4 and 13). In addition, Singhal teaches “the accessing step comprises the step of querying the database with the speech retrieval document to retrieve documents that are similar to each other (e.g. p. 243, §3.2, retrieval).

Regarding **claims 6 and 15**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 5 and 14). In addition, Singhal teaches “the querying step comprises retrieving a predetermined number of documents which are most similar to the speech retrieval document (p. 247, ¶1, retrieving the ten most similar documents).

Regarding **claims 7 and 16**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 6 and 15). In addition, Singhal teaches “the predetermined number is ten” (p. 247, ¶1, retrieving the ten most similar documents).

Regarding **claims 8 and 17**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claims 6 and 15). In addition, Singhal teaches “the truncating step comprises the step of modifying the original vectors according to a weighting function to produce the truncated vectors” (p. 247, see ¶2, for the document weight calculation).

Regarding **claim 9**, Singhal in view of Hutson teaches the use of the indicated formula (p. 247, ¶2 see formula).

Regarding **claim 18**, this claim has limitations similar to claims 1 and 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 19**, this claim has limitations similar to claims 1 and 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding **claim 20**, this claim has limitations similar to claims 1 and 10 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to V. Paul Harper whose telephone number is (571) 272-7605. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2654

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

5/27/2005

V. Paul Harper
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2654

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "V. Paul Harper". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "V." and "Paul" on the first line and "Harper" on the second line.